

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Figure 5 was canceled because it was unnecessary for one to understand, make, or use the claimed invention.

While there were many changes to figures 1-4 and 6-9 attempting to bring them into compliance with 37 CFR 1.84, the materiality of the content of those drawings was left essentially unchanged. Photographs were the only practicable medium for illustrating the claimed invention for “hidden pixelization.” Replacement sheet 7 was changed so that a simpler depiction of a photograph made for a clearer understanding the invention, but as for drawing standards under 37 CFR 1.84(b), replacement sheet 7 should still be considered a black and white photograph as hidden pixelization is necessarily associated with photographs. Depictions of typographical fonts in other replacement sheets should also be treated as pictures or pictographs because converting a font to a line drawing would necessarily change the visual character of the font pertaining to the claimed invention’s use of font fingerprinting.

Most of the elements of original claims 1-13 were gathered and rearranged in this application in hopes to better focus on what may be considered patentable subject matter over the prior art as entered in this first office action. However, the amendments to the claims would have been so numerous that cancellation and rewriting became the preferred method of amendment.

In this office action, the Examiner has acknowledged that original claim 4 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would have been allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and also rewritten to overcome all rejections because none of the prior art cited in this first office action discloses or reasonably suggests transfer of ownership of media content over the Internet, using a computer, the media content comprising an individually coded license, serial number or other identifying mark through content fingerprinting that uses a code visible or audible or otherwise noticeable only by a machine on a first mark that is a first private key of a first public/private key pair to indicate that merchandise is authentic, and also a second label comprising a second private key of a second private/public key pair to authenticate the delivery of said media content.

New claim 20 is an independent claim originally supported by the disclosure in the specification and at least in part within original claims of the original application. The claims as filed in the original specification are part of the disclosure and, therefore, if an application as originally filed contains a claim disclosing material not found in the remainder of the specification, the applicant may amend the specification to include the claimed subject matter. In re Benno, 768 F.2d 1340, 226 USPQ 683 (Fed. Cir. 1985), see also MPEP 2163. With the replacement specification included in this mailing, which includes support for new claim 20, and rewritten claim language that incorporates allowable subject matter as suggested by the examiner, new claim 20 should now be in a condition for allowance.

In this office action the Examiner has acknowledged that original claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and also rewritten to overcome all objections because none of the prior art cited in this first office action discloses or reasonably suggests printing a ticket, card, paper, etc., comprising transfer of ownership of Internet content.

New claim 14 is an independent claim supported by the original disclosure that incorporates allowable subject matter as stated above and new claim 14 should now be in a condition for allowance.

In this office action, the Examiner has acknowledged that original claim 5 was not necessarily supported by the disclosure and that it was unclear whether claim 5 could be rewritten to set forth clearly the limitation distinguishing it from the prior art of record while being properly supported by the disclosure.

New claim 22 is an independent claim originally supported by the specification in the disclosure and at least in part within original claims of the original application. The claims as filed in the original specification are part of the disclosure and, therefore, if an application as originally filed contains a claim disclosing material not found in the remainder of the specification, the applicant may amend the specification to include the claimed subject matter. In re Benno, 768 F.2d 1340, 226 USPQ 683 (Fed. Cir. 1985), see also MPEP 2163. With the replacement specification included in this mailing, which includes support for new claim 22, and rewritten claim language that incorporates allowable subject matter as nothing in the prior art of record suggests it, new claim 22 should now be in a condition for allowance.

All other new claims are dependent claims based on at least one of the base claims as discussed above.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Attachments

Respectfully submitted,  
James L. Driessen, Pro Se Applicant  
By James L. Driessen  
James L. Driessen Tel.: (801) 796-6014